

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2008.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANTS' AMENDMENTS

The present reply amends Claims 1, 11, 18, and 25, leaving for Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-34. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2008, Claims 1-6, 9-13, 16-20 and 23-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson (U.S. Patent No. 7,093,005) in view of "Java Server Startup". Claims 7, 14, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Sommerer ("The Java Archive (JAR) File Format"). Claims 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Aziz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,956 hereafter Aziz).

Claims 1, 11, 18, and 25

As amended, Claim 1 defines using a domain template, wherein configuring the domain includes configuring a database service and a messaging service for the domain. Patterson, in view of Sommerer, does not disclose configuring a database service and a messaging service as part of configuring a domain. For example, Patterson discloses defining a datacenter using basic building blocks and their logical connections and saving this structure.

Claim 1 has also been amended to more clearly define a silent mode in which a user can configure the domain using a user-defined script that specifies the domain template to be used and customizes information in the domain template according to the user's preferences. Patterson, in view of Sommerer, does not disclose such a script. For example, Patterson appears to disclose that a script of actions can be run in response to an error message or when a server is added or removed from a tier.

Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that a second user interface, operable to configure a cluster, includes prompting the user to assign managed servers to a cluster in the domain wherein the second user interface is displayed only if the user has defined at least one cluster in the first user interface. Patterson, in view of Sommerer, does

not disclose this feature. For example, Patterson appears to disclose a dialog that displays servers that are already assigned to a server tier and which can be used to configure parameters related to those servers. Additionally, Patterson, in view of Sommerer, does not disclose that the dialog is displayed only if the user has defined at least one cluster.

Furthermore, Claim 1 has been amended to define providing a third user interface operable to configure each computer in the domain including specifying a name for each computer and specifying node manager information for each computer. Applicant respectfully submits that Patterson, in view of Sommerer, does not disclose this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 18 and 25 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11, 18 and 25, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, and 26-34

Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, and 26-34 have not been addressed separately. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, and 26-34 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-24, and 26-34 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Application No. 10/780,497
Office Action mailed: November 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action dated: December 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 29, 2008

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59725

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800